		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	72-1 Page 1
NRC FORM 699 (9-2003)	RM 699 U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION		
CONVERSATION RECORD			10/21/2004 TIME
			2:00pm
NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH	H YOU	TELEPHONE NO.	TYPE OF CONVERSATION
Ed Secko, Jim Ellis, Christopher Monetta		815-942-5590	VISIT
ORGANIZATION			CONFERENCE
GE Morris Operation, ISFSI			TELEPHONE
SUBJECT			INCOMING
License Amendment Request 12		•	OUTGOING
CUBBIADY (Continue on Page 2)		, 	V cordenta
SUMMARY (Continue on Page 2)	va isawaa magandina submittal s	of the Amendment 12 and	mariaiom to licemas
NRC called to convey short list of outstandin renewal application. In summary GEMO (C provide the NRC with revised TS pages and will result in no need for additional informat	Chris Monetta)agreed that min CSAR pages within 2 weeks (1	nor changes would be nec	essary and committed to
The specific issues were as follows: 1. GEMO requested TS Table 4-1 be remove Table 4-1 may be modified to remove unneed information still applicable is summarily descent to the SAR to be consistent with the changes of the CSAR to be consistent with the changes of the CSAR to be consistent with the changes of the CSAR to the site Safety Committee. NRC as for when repetitive failures must be reviewed unchanged or information would be added to 4. TS 6.2.2 GEMO requested be deleted. NRC description of the minimum skills and experience the revision. 5. The NRC raised some concern regarding of GEMO requested this TS be deleted. NRC a provided adequate summary was contained it staff to CSAR section 7.7.1 which summarized (continued page 2)	led requirements (i.e., frequent cribed in the CSAR. GEMO at able 4-1 shall also be suitably made to Table 4-1. GEMO agrange appropriate be advised TS may be modified be able to the CSAR in lieu of the TS. C agreed this is appropriate be ence levels for all personnel or TS 8.1 which describes the GE agreed the contents of TS 8.1 bin the CSAR. Both agreed furt	ncy) provided acceptance of aggred to make this chang revised with similar informed with this approach. The threshold for performing that CSAR must descrip MO agreed that either the owever the CSAR must in the Plant Safety Commit and the Plant Safety Commit and the deleted with reference to the review was necessary	eriteria remain and the ge. mation moved from TS to g root cause analysis and be program requirements e TS would remain accorporate, per 72.28(c), a ttee. GEMO agreed to coring program (EMP). o an EMP is appropriate
Continue on Page 2			
ACTION REQUIRED	<u>-</u>		
NRC Action Required: None. GEMO Requiresponse to the above NRC feedback within 2		rovide revised TS, CSAR,	, and RAI pages in
NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION	SIGNATURE		DATE
C. Regan	SIGNATURE THE	fr.	10/21/2004
ACTION TAKEN		<i></i>	
None TITLE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION	SIGNATURE OF PERSON TAKI	ING ACTION	DATE
			1

CONVERSATION RECORD (Continued)

SUMMARY (Continue on Page 3)

6. NRC noted an inconsistency in how GEMO had defined the list of SSCs "important to safety." The list contained in Chapter A8 of the CSAR was adequate however the lists of SSCs important to safety contained in TS 5.2 and the revised RAI response (notable RAIs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and the Table included in 1.3) were not consistent with the list contained in CSAR section A8. GEMO agreed these were oversights and would resubmit revisions to those RAI responses and TS that were not consistent with CSAR section A8.

7. The staff asked for clarification as to the disposition of the water tower/well water pumps and why they were not considered important to safety based on previous discussion with GEMO. GEMO noted that since the completion of the Basin Water level and conductivity test GEMO is now arguing that crediting either of these components as important to safety is no longer required based on the time duration before minimum water levels are reached in the basin. The staff agreed to take this into consideration.

Persons also participating John Monninger (NRC), Mark Orr (NRC Contractor)